

is independent. Claims 1-4 were rejected and Claims 5-11 were withdraw from consideration by the Examiner. Following this amendment, Claims 1-11 remain in this application.

I. Objection to the Title

In the Office Action dated January 17, 2002, the Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive. The title has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggested title and Applicants submit that this objection has been overcome. Applicants submit that no new matter been added by this amendments.

II. Objection to Claims 1-4

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1-4 as containing various informalities. Claims 1-4 have been amended to correct these informalities and Applicants submit that this objection has been overcome. Applicants submit that Claims 1-4 have not been narrowed nor has any new matter been added by these amendments.

III. Objection to Claims 5-10

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 5-11 as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Claims 5-11 have been amended to correct this problem and Applicants submit that this objection has been overcome. Applicants submit that Claims

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

5-11 have not been narrowed nor has any new matter been added by these amendments.

IV. Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1-11 have been amended to correct grammatical errors and to conform them to idiomatic English. Applicants submit that Claims 1-11 have not been narrowed nor has any new matter been added by these amendments. Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby requested. If there are any fees

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

required for an extension of time or under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 22, 2002

By: 

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640
(404) 653-6559

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

3. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to] of claim 1, wherein said [projection] projections for positional location of said permanent [magnet] magnets are [is] provided on [an edge] edges of said permanent magnet embedding [hole] holes on [a side] sides of said non-magnetic [region] regions.

4. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to any] of claim 1 [to 3], wherein said [projection] projections for positional location of said permanent magnets are [is] provided so as to project towards [a center] centers of said permanent magnet embedding [hole] holes into [and] recesses corresponding to said [projection] projections [is provided in said permanent magnet].

5. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to any] of [claims] claim 1 [to 4], wherein a length of a side where said permanent magnet and said projection for positional location of said permanent magnet make contact is 5% to 75% of said length of a side of said permanent magnet.

6. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to any] of [claims] claim 1 [to 4], wherein a centrifugal force on [of] said permanent magnet is supported by a face intersecting a direction of magnetization of said permanent magnet at right angles and on an opposite side of said permanent magnet embedding hole to a side of the non-magnetic region.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

7. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to any] of [claims] claim 1 [to 4], wherein a radiussed portion of a root of said projection for positional location of said permanent magnet is provided on a side of a face intersecting a direction of magnetization of said permanent magnet at right angles and on an opposite side to a side of said non-magnetic region.

8. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to any] of [claims] claim 1 [to 4], wherein a length in a circumferential direction of a circumferential-side thin-wall region of said permanent magnet embedding hole in said rotor core is no more than 450% of a thickness of said thin-wall region in a radial direction.

9. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to] of claim 8, wherein a thickness in a radial direction of said circumferential-side thin-wall region of the permanent magnet embedding hole in said rotor core is at least 0.5 mm[or more].

10. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to any] of [claims] claim 1 [to 4], wherein a length in a radial direction of [said] a bridge region between adjacent permanent magnet embedding holes in said rotor core is no more than 450% of a thickness in a circumferential direction of a bridge region on a side nearest a center.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

11. (Amended) The permanent magnet reluctance motor [according to] of claim 10, wherein a thickness on the side nearest the center in a circumferential direction of said bridge region between adjacent permanent magnet embedding holes in said rotor core is at least 0.5 mm[or more].

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com